

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the present response, claims 1, 3 and 24 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 23 and 28 have been canceled. Claims 36-48 have been added, and it is believed that these new claims are supported by the application as originally filed. Consequently, claims 1, 3, 5-22, 24-27, and 29-48 are currently pending and under consideration.

The applicant's undersigned representative first wishes to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 18-22 and 35 as well as for indicating on page 12 of the Office Action that claims 4, 8, 15, 28 and 34 contained allowable subject matter. In addition, the applicant's representative wishes to thank Examiner Shimizu for his assistance during the telephonic interview of September 13, 2005. At the interview, proposed claim amendments were discussed regarding the above-identified application. The proposed amendments to the claims are generally the same as those presented at the interview with the notable exceptions discussed below.

As mentioned during the interview, the features of dependent claim 4 have been incorporated into independent claim 1. Given that claim 4 was indicated as being allowable, it is believed that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. Like in the proposed amendments from the interview, the features from previous dependent claims 8 and 15 have been rewritten in independent form as new independent claims 36 and 37, respectively. Since claims 8 and 15 were indicated in the Office Action as containing allowable subject matter, it is submitted that new independent claims 36 and 37 are in condition for allowance. The features recited in dependent claim 28 have been incorporated into independent claim 24, and as a result, independent claim 24 should now be in condition for allowance because the Office Action indicated that claim 28 contained allowable subject matter.

As discussed at the interview, new independent 38 recites the features from allowable dependent claim 34 with the exception that it does not incorporate the features from intermediate dependent claim 33. It should be noted that the features of intermediate claim 33 are now recited at dependent claim 39. Based on the comments on page 12 of the Office Action regarding claim

34 that "the prior arts fail to teach or fairly suggest said image display is configured to display a cell indicator that identifies an individual cell within the storage location", it is believed that the features of intermediate claim 33 were not needed to distinguish claim 34 from the references of record. Consequently, it is submitted that new independent claim 38 and its dependent claim are in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 40, along with some of its dependent claims, has been modified in accordance with the Examiner's comments during the interview. It is believed that independent claim 40, in its current form, is allowable over the references of record. For example, U.S. Patent No. 5,812,986 to Danelski as well as the other references of record fails to disclose or suggest "displaying on the image display of the pick/put to display device a first visual indicator that points to the first storage location; outputting contents of the first file associated with the first storage location with the pick/put to display device; displaying on the image display of the pick/put to display device a second visual indicator that points to the second storage location; and outputting contents of the second file associated with the second storage location with the pick/put to display device" as is recited in claim 40. As should be appreciated, the light directed modules 106 in Danelski lack an image display, and moreover, the light directed modules 106 only service a single location, not multiple storage locations. The other references of record fail to remedy the features missing in Danelski. For instance, the other references of record fail to disclose or even fairly suggest a pick/put to display device that is able to service two storage locations from a single location while having the ability to store and output content, such as audio instructions, visual instructions or other content, which is associated with the respective storage locations. For this and other reasons, it is submitted that independent claim 40 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.


On August 18, 2003, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) (including the PTO/SB/08 forms as well as the cited non-patent publications) was submitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). The Applicants complied with the USPTO rules regarding submission of the reference for the IDS. However, the applicants have not yet received an initialed copy of the IDS's SB/08 forms. After reviewing PAIR, it appears that this IDS and copies of the previously enclosed references were entered into the file. Since this IDS is on PAIR, duplicate copies of the references and the IDS are not enclosed. However, if the

Examiner is unable to access or locate the IDS and its accompanying paperwork, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to quickly resolve the issue. The Applicants believe that this omission was accidental and kindly request a copy of the IDS's SB/08 forms be returned with the initials of the Examiner placed by the cited references.

It should be understood that the above remarks are not intended to provide an exhaustive basis for patentability or concede the basis for the rejections in the Office Action, but are simply provided to overcome the rejections made in the Office Action in the most expedient fashion.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If after reviewing this amendment the Examiner feels that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Charles P. Schmal, Reg. No. 45,082
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456